## Suggested Solution of Assignment 3

1. Show that inf  $X \ge \inf Y$  whenever  $X \subseteq Y \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  and hence that  $m^*(A) \uparrow$  (i.e.  $m^*(A) \le m^*(B)$  if  $A \subseteq B \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ ).

**Solution.** Let  $x \in X$ . Then  $x \in Y$ , and hence by the definition of infimum,  $x \ge \inf Y$ . Since  $x \in X$  is arbitrary, we have  $\inf X \ge \inf Y$ . The last statement follows immediately from the definition

$$m^*(A) := \inf\{\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \ell(I_k) : \{I_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \text{ is a countable open-interval cover of } A\},$$

and the fact that if  $A \subseteq B \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ , then any countable interval cover of B is also a countable interval cover of A.

2. Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an algebra of subsets of X. Show that  $\mathcal{A}$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra if (and only if)  $\mathcal{A}$  is stable with respect to countable disjoint unions:

$$\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \in \mathcal{A} \text{ whenever } A_n \in \mathcal{A} \ \forall n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } A_m \cap A_n = \emptyset \ \forall m \neq n.$$

**Solution.** Suppose  $\mathcal{A}$  is an algebra of subset of X that is stable with respect to countable disjoint unions. To show that  $\mathcal{A}$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra, it suffices to show that  $\mathcal{A}$  is stable with respect to countable (but not necessarily disjoint) union. Let  $B_n \in \mathcal{A}$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Define

$$C_1 := B_1$$
 and  $C_n := B_n \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^{n-1} B_k$  for  $n \ge 2$ .

Clearly the collection  $\{C_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  is pairwise disjoint, and each  $C_n \in \mathcal{A}$  since  $\mathcal{A}$  is an algebra. Moreover,

$$C_1 \cup C_2 = B_1 \cup (B_2 \setminus B_1) = B_1 \cup B_2,$$
  
 $C_1 \cup C_2 \cup C_3 = B_1 \cup B_2 \cup (B_3 \setminus (B_1 \cup B_2)) = B_1 \cup B_2 \cup B_3,$   
 $\vdots$ 

and so on. Hence  $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} C_n \in \mathcal{A}$ .

3. Suppose  $[a, b] \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  is covered by a finite family  $\mathcal{C}$  of open intervals. Show that  $b - a \leq$  sum of lengths of intervals in  $\mathcal{C}$  (by MI to  $n := \#(\mathcal{C})$ , the number of elements of  $\mathcal{C}$ ).

**Solution.** Let P(n) be the statement: if [a,b] is a closed bounded interval that is covered by a finite family  $\mathcal{C}$  of open intervals with  $\#(\mathcal{C}) = n$ , then  $b - a \leq \text{sum}$  of lengths of intervals in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

Suppose  $\#(\mathcal{C}) = 1$  and  $\mathcal{C} = \{[c,d]\}$ . Then clearly  $b - a \leq d - c$ . Hence P(1) is true.

Assume that P(k) is true. Suppose [a, b] is a closed bounded interval that is covered by a finite family  $C = \{(c_i, d_i)\}_{i=1}^{k+1}$  of open intervals. Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $a \in (c_1, d_1)$ .

If  $b \leq d_1$ , then  $b - a \leq d_1 - c_1 \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} |c_i - d_i|$ , and we are done.

On the other hand, suppose  $b > d_1$ . Then  $[d_1, b]$  is a closed bounded interval covered by  $\{(c_i, d_i)\}_{i=2}^{k+1}$ . Now the induction assumption implies that

$$b-d_1 \le \sum_{i=2}^{k+1} |c_i - d_i|,$$

and hence

$$b-a = (d_1-a) + (b-d_1) \le |c_1-d_1| + \sum_{i=2}^{k+1} |c_i-d_i| = \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} |c_i-d_i|.$$

So P(k+1) is true.

By MI, P(n) is true for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

4. (cf. Royden 3rd, p.52, Q51) Upper/Lower Envelopes of  $f:[a,b] \to \mathbb{R}$ .

Define  $h, g : [a, b] \to [-\infty, \infty]$  by

$$h(y) := \inf\{h_{\delta}(y) : \delta > 0\}$$
 for all  $y \in [a, b]$ ,

where  $h_{\delta}(y) := \sup\{f(x) : x \in [a, b], |x - y| < \delta\}$ ; and

$$g(y) := \sup\{g_{\delta}(y) : \delta > 0\}$$
 for all  $y \in [a, b]$ ,

where  $g_{\delta}(y) := \inf\{f(x) : x \in [a, b], |x - y| < \delta\}$ . Prove the following:

- (a)  $g \le f \le h$  pointwisely on [a, b], and for all  $x \in [a, b]$ , g(x) = f(x) if and only if f is lower semicontinuous (l.s.c) at x (f(x) = h(x) if and only if f is upper semicontinuous (u.s.c) at x), so g(x) = h(x) if and only if f is continuous at f.
- (b) If f is bounded (so g, h are real-valued), then g is l.s.c and h is u.s.c.
- (c) If  $\phi$  is a l.s.c function on [a, b] such that  $\phi \leq f$  (pointwise) on [a, b], then  $\phi \leq g$ . State and show the corresponding result for h.
- (d) Let  $C_n := \{x \in [a, b] : h(x) g(x) < \frac{1}{n}\}$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then  $C := \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} C_n$  is exactly the set of all continuity points of f and is a  $G_{\delta}$ -set.

Note: More suggestive notations for g,h are  $\underline{f},\overline{f}.$ 

**Solution.** (a) Clearly  $g_{\delta}(x) \leq f(x) \leq h_{\delta}(x)$  for all  $x \in [a, b]$  and  $\delta > 0$ . Hence  $g \leq f \leq h$  pointwisely on [a, b].

Suppose f is l.s.c at x, that is, for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that  $f(x) - \varepsilon < f(y)$  whenever  $y \in [a, b]$  and  $|y - x| < \delta$ . Then  $f(x) - \varepsilon \le g_{\delta}(x) \le g(x)$ . Since  $\varepsilon > 0$  is arbitrary, we have  $f(x) \le g(x)$ , and hence f(x) = g(x).

On the other hand, suppose f(x) = g(x). Then, by the definition of g and  $g_{\delta}$ , given any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$f(x) - \varepsilon = g(x) - \varepsilon < g_{\delta}(x) \le f(y)$$
 whenever  $y \in [a, b]$  and  $|y - x| < \delta$ .

Thus f is l.s.c at x.

Similarly, one can show that f(x) = h(x) if and only if f is u.s.c at x.

The last assertion now follows immediately from above and the simple fact that f is continuous at x if and only if it is both l.s.c and u.s.c at x.

(b) Let  $x \in [a, b]$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Since g is real-valued, we can find  $\delta > 0$  such that  $g(x) < g_{\delta}(x) + \varepsilon$ . Note that  $(y - \delta/2, y + \delta/2) \subseteq (x - \delta, x + \delta)$  if  $|x - y| < \delta/2$ . It follows from the definition of g and  $g_{\delta}$  that whenever  $y \in [a, b]$  with  $|y - x| < \delta/2$ , we have

$$g(x) - \varepsilon < g_{\delta}(x) \le g_{\delta/2}(y) \le g(y).$$

Therefore g is l.s.c at x and hence on [a, b].

Similarly one can show that h is u.s.c on [a, b].

(c) It suffices to prove that if  $\phi$  is l.s.c at x and  $\phi \leq f$  on [a, b], then  $\phi(x) \leq g(x)$ . From the definition,

$$\underline{\phi}(x) := \sup_{\delta > 0} \inf_{|y-x| < \delta} \phi(y) \leq \sup_{\delta > 0} \inf_{|y-x| < \delta} f(y) = g(x).$$

Since  $\phi$  is l.s.c at x, we have  $\phi(x) = \phi(x)$  by (a), and the result follows.

Similarly, one can prove the corresponding result for h: if  $\psi$  is a u.s.c function on [a,b] such that  $f \leq \psi$  on [a,b], then  $h \leq \psi$ .

(d) By (a), we have

$$\{x\in[a,b]:f\text{ continuous at }x\}=\{x\in[a,b]:g(x)=h(x)\}$$
 
$$=\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty}\{x\in[a,b]:h(x)-g(x)<1/n\}$$
 
$$=\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty}C_n=C.$$

Note that k := h - g is u.s.c on  $[a, b] \setminus \{x : h(x) = +\infty \text{ or } g(x) = -\infty\}.$ 

To see that C is a  $G_{\delta}$ -set (in [a,b]), it suffices to show that, given any  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $A := \{x \in [a,b] : k(x) < \lambda\}$  is an open set in [a,b].

Let  $x \in A$ . Then  $k(x) \neq +\infty$ . Set  $\varepsilon_0 := (\lambda - k(x))/2 > 0$ . Since k is u.s.c at x, there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that if  $y \in [a, b]$  and  $|y - x| < \delta$ , then

$$k(y) < k(x) + \varepsilon_0 = k(x) + \frac{\lambda - k(x)}{2} = \frac{\lambda + k(x)}{2} < \lambda.$$

Thus  $B_{\delta}(x) \cap [a,b] \subseteq A$ . Hence A is open in [a,b].

5. Let  $f:[a,b] \to [m,M]$ . For each  $P \in \operatorname{Par}[a,b]$ , let u(f;P) and U(f;P) denote the lower/upper Riemann-sum functions. Let  $\{P_n:n\in\mathbb{N}\}$  be a sequence of partitions such that  $P_n\subseteq P_{n+1}\ \forall n$  and  $\|P_n\|\to 0$  ( $\|P\|$  is the max subinterval length of P). Show that,  $\forall x\in[a,b]\setminus A$ 

$$\lim_{n} (u(f; P_n))(x) = \underline{f}(x)$$
 and  $\lim_{n} (U(f; P_n))(x) = \overline{f}(x)$ ,

where A denotes the union of all end-points of  $P_n \, \forall \, n$ .

**Solution.** Let P be the partition  $a = t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_k = b$ . Then the lower and upper Riemann-sum functions can be defined as follow:

$$u(f,P) := \sum_{i=1}^{k} \inf_{x \in (t_{i-1},t_i]} f(x) \chi_{(t_{i-1},t_i]}, \qquad U(f,P) := \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sup_{x \in (t_{i-1},t_i]} f(x) \chi_{(t_{i-1},t_i]}.$$

Let  $\{P_n\}$  be a sequence of partitions such that  $P_n \subseteq P_{n+1} \,\forall n$  and  $\|P_n\| \to 0$ . Then  $u(f; P_n)$  is an increasing sequence of functions, so that  $\lim_n u(f; P_n)$  exists. Since  $u(f; P_n)$  is bounded above by f on (a, b] and is l.s.c at  $x \in [a, b] \setminus A$ , it follows from (the proof of) 4(c) that

$$u(f; P_n)(x) \le f(x), \text{ for all } x \in [a, b] \setminus A, \ n \in \mathbb{N}.$$
 (1)

Fix  $x \in [a, b] \setminus A$ . Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Since f is l.s.c at x, there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$\underline{f}(x) - \varepsilon < \underline{f}(y) \le f(y)$$
 whenever  $y \in [a, b]$  and  $|y - x| < \delta$ .

Choose N so large such that  $||P_N|| < \delta$ . Suppose  $a = t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_k = b$  are the end-points of  $P_N$ . Then

$$\underline{f}(x) - \varepsilon \le \sum_{i=1}^{k} \inf_{y \in (t_{i-1}, t_i]} f(y) \chi_{(t_{i-1}, t_i]}(x) = u(f; P_N)(x). \tag{2}$$

Combining (1) and (2), we have

$$f(x) - \varepsilon \le u(f; P_N)(x) \le u(f; P_n)(x) \le f(x)$$
 for  $n \ge N$ ,

and hence  $\lim_{n} u(f; P_n)(x) = \underline{f}(x)$ .

Similarly we can show that  $\lim_{n} U(f; P_n)(x) = \overline{f}(x)$  for  $x \in [a, b] \setminus A$ .

•